

**REMARKS****May 3, 2005 Telephonic Interview**

The Examiner is thanked for the opportunity to discuss the outstanding issues in the pending application.

During the interview the following issues were discussed.

1. Drawings Objection. The Examiner had originally taken the position that drawings must be included to reference "floodlights" and "180 degree" arc displacement of the conveyors. Applicant advised that MPEP §601.01(f) does not require amendment to the drawings since claims 1 and 2 are pending method claims. The Examiner, after consulting with a Senior Examiner, agreed that the arc displacement mechanism need not be shown in greater detail. Applicant agreed to incorporate reference number "14" in a replacement drawing sheet specifically for Fig. 19. However, the Examiner did not expressly agree to withdraw his objection with regard to the floodlights.

2. Claims 1 & 2 grammatical informalities. Applicant agreed to amend claims 1 and 2 to insert "pair of" in front of "conveyors" to distinguish from the earlier described "pallet conveyor".

3. Houston reference. The Examiner advised Applicant that the Houston reference cited in the 04-13-2005 Office Action, US Pat. No. 2,699,877 was incorrect. The correct reference has now been communicated to Applicant to be US Pat. No. 2,590,965.

4. Scope of rejected claims. The Examiner advised that the claims rejected under 35 USC 102 in the 04-13-2005 Office Action (i.e. claims 2-12), was a typographical error and that the claims which actually stand rejected are claims 3-12.

\*\*\*\*\*

**July 13, 2005 Telephonic Interview**

A telephonic interview was held between applicant's attorney and the examiner's SPE, Mr. Thomas Will. As a result of this interview, Mr. Will agreed that claim 3 would be allowable if the phrase "capable of" was deleted. Applicant has agreed to this amendment since the function of the displaceable arms, displacing a respective conveyor in a substantially 180 arc over said vehicle, has not changed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The following is Applicant's formal response to the Office Action dated 04-13-2005.

**1. Drawings Objection**

A replacement drawing sheet is submitted as part of this Response in accordance with the agreement reached with the Examiner during the 05-03-2005 telephonic interview.

The other issue was whether floodlights were required to be incorporated into the drawings. At this time, Applicant has elected to cancel claims 5, 6, 8, 11 & 12. These are dependent claims pertaining to the use of floodlights. Applicant reserves the right to present claims pertaining to the use of floodlights in any subsequent continuation or continuation-in-part application.

**2. Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended in accordance with the agreement reached with the Examiner during the 05-03-2005 telephonic interview.

**3. Claim Rejections**

As a result of the 07-13-2005 telephonic interview with the SPE, previously rejected claims 3, 4 and 7 should be allowable based upon the amendment to claim 3.

With respect to now canceled independent claim 9 and dependent claim 10, Applicant reserves the right to present these claims in any subsequent continuation or continuation-in-part application.

**CONCLUSION**

All outstanding issues have been addressed. Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case for all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 13, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ralph D. Chabot", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ralph D. Chabot, Reg. No. 39,133  
Attorney for Applicant